DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 993 JC 770 030

AUTHOR Kerstiens, Gene
TITLE A Preliminary Assessment of the Enrollment Pattern, Motivation, and Course Effectiveness for Students Completing Learning Skills Minicourses.
PUB DATE 5 Jan 77
NOTE 35p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Skills; Community Colleges; *Junior Colleges; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Short Courses; *Student Attitudes; Student Enrollment; Student Motivation; Student Recruitment; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS El Camino College

ABSTRACT

An anonymous suvey was administered to all students completing learning skills minicourses (n=141) during the fall 1976 semester at El Camino College (California). The survey was designed to provide information for the purposes of identifying and evaluating the recruitment strategies for and enrollment motivations of students completing the minicourses, and to assess minicourse effectiveness. Analysis of the data revealed that: (1) the class schedule and college counselors were the most effective recruiting agents; (2) a majority of the students were attracted to minicourses chiefly because of the courses' intensive nature; (3) students enrolled primarily to become more efficient and self-confident learners and for their own satisfaction; (4) 68.1% of the students felt the minicourses to be helpful or extremely helpful; (5) those students most closely resembling non-traditional students (Group A) were interested in the fact that minicourses concentrated on a single skill while the more traditional students (Group B) found the short duration of the minicourses most appealing; and (6) Group A found the use of instructional media most helpful while Group B preferred short lecture/discussion sessions. The survey instrument and tabulated data are appended. (Author/JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED132993

A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF THE ENROLLMENT PATTERN, MOTIVATION, AND COURSE EFFECTIVENESS FOR STUDENTS COMPLETING LEARNING SKILLS MINICOURSES

by

Gene Kerstiens

El Camino College

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

January 5, 1977

JC 770 030

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to identify and evaluate the recruitment strategies for and enrollment motivation of students enrolled in and completing Learning Skills minicourses and to determine the effectiveness of the minicourses through the development and administration of a student evaluation survey. This survey was administered to all students completing Learning Skills minicourses (N=141) during the Fall 1976 semester.

The data revealed that (1) the class Schedule and College counselors were the most effective recruiting agents; (2) a majority of students were attracted to minicourses chiefly because of the courses' intensive nature; (3) a majority of students perceived that in-class activity sessions constituted the most effective instructional strategy; (4) a majority of students evaluated their experience in minicourses as "very" or "extremely" helpful. Chi-square comparison of the responses of two subgroups, one of which was identified as and determined to fit more closely the non traditional student profile as discussed and examined by Roueche (1976), revealed a significant difference on only two survey items, both of which dealt with preferences concerning instructional strategies.

Implications of and recommendations concerning the study's findings were discussed and included, on the local level, recommendations involving changes in recruitment strategies and emphases, and, on the national level, recommendations concerning increased activity in the area of research involving the attitudinal and behavioral disposition of non traditional students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 1

Significance of This Study 3

Objectives of the Study 5

Assumptions 6

Hypotheses 7

Definitions of Terms 9

PROCEDURE 10

The Study Design 10

The Samples 10

Data Collection Procedures 10

Procedure for Treating Data 11

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 12

Discussion 12

Implications 15

Recommendations 16

REFERENCES 18

APPENDICES 20

Appendix A 20

Appendix B 23

Appendix C 27

Appendix D 28

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Learning Skills minicourses are courses that are a component of El Camino College's academic support system designed to help students improve those communication skills that are vital to student success in most academic courses. Minicourses are not designed to be remedial or developmental courses as such, inasmuch as they are not listed in the College Catalog as pre-college level courses or as part of an entry or preparatory system. Further, students are not placed in or tracked into these courses via a disqualifying score on a standardized exam or by virtue of low high school grades. Rather, the courses are scheduled so that the student can enroll in and complete them while and not merely before he takes other courses in the college curriculum. In fact, it is recommended that a student enrolling in a minicourse also be concurrently enrolled in at least one other college course requiring texts and tests and hopefully requiring course-related skills in reading, writing, outlining, listening, notetaking, and test-taking.

The learning skills minicourses presently offered consist of Learning Skills 20, Prewriting Workshop; Learning Skills 25, Workshop in Critical Thinking; Learning Skills 30, Worksnop in Test-Taking; and Learning Skills 35, Listening-Notetaking Workshop. These minicourses are defined in the "Definitions of Terms" section of this practicum, and

the terms minicourse and workshop are considered as convertible terms for the purpose of this paper.

Because it is, then, difficult to classify these minicourses as purely remedial, developmental, or traditional, those in the academic community who find these designations comfortable are disturbed by the courses' lack of convenient categorization--and even by their existence. This might be expected; for, like some other innovative instructional approaches, minicourses reflect an attitude of dissent from the rather commonly and tacitly accepted notions that

-- a standard English course sequence is an accepted pattern and therefore a more reliable--or defensible--vehicle for developing communication skills (see Worthen, 1967);
-- the lecture-classroom, three-unit course is the most viable medium for conditioning students to apprehend the communication skills necessary for college-level learning (see Milton, 1972);
-- the typical semester-length developmental reading and/or writing course (see Sweiger, 1972) is sufficient to prepare students to perform effectively in other courses;
-- students should be tracked into a prescribed curricular sequence because they are unable to make prudent discriminations concerning the specific treatments they need to build communication skills (see Sweiger, 1972);
-- credit/no credit courses are ineffective low-grade service courses that lack academic integrity, especially because they do not assign grades indicative of levels of attainment and avoid hierarchical grading (see Milton, 1972);

-- students should qualify on a nationally-normed achievement or aptitude test before engaging in the standard college curriculum (see Sweiger, 1972);

-- the use of media, however enlightened or integral to the course objectives, is essentially a crutch and is inferior to a primarily lecture-oriented delivery system (Worthen, 1967);

-- courses designed to respond to student interest or to stated and immediate student need attract a population of students whose academic intentions are suspect (Vaughan, Elosser, and Flynn, 1976).

In violating so many of the traditional expectations of post-secondary education, the minicourse, and perhaps deservedly, comes under attack because it does not closely enough resemble the standard "Model I" model of instructional design and scope described and explained by Cross (1974). Consequently, this study is one answer to the charge that the minicourse should undergo evaluative scrutiny in order to prove itself as deserving a place in the curriculum.

The Significance of this Study

That communication-oriented minicourses are evaluated at all appears to be of some significance in itself. A review of the professional literature indicates that thus far minicourse practitioners and researchers apparently have reported only literature that reflects course descriptions and expectations (see Scarafiotti and Schoolland, 1974; Spaulding, 1974), although one practitioner has reported outcomes that are glowing in terms of student success in subsequently taken content courses (Editors of Change, 1976).

Given the prolific literature on instructional evaluation, it is somewhat surprising that formative and summative studies concerning course effectiveness have exerted only very modest influence on instructional and curricular change or improvement (Wittrock, 1973). Also, considering the controversies that have arisen over the validity and accuracy of research designs calculated to measure course and program effectiveness (see Fairbanks, 1975; Meeth, 1976; Sherman, 1976; Trent and Cohen, 1973), the problem of choosing and/or fashioning a design becomes at best troublesome. Although writers agree that controversy is, and perhaps inevitably, far from resolvement, it appears that seven identifiable methods and styles of instructional evaluation have emerged and, in different dimensions and frequencies, have entered the evaluative arena. These designs and approaches are represented in the following models or criteria:

1. Pre-post-tests on standardized achievement tests
2. Pre-post-tests on criterion-referenced tests (instructor or department authored)
3. Grade point average after completion of evaluated course
4. Success in a course for which the course being evaluated serves as prerequisite
5. Attrition in the course being evaluated and/or attrition or dropout rate in other courses for which the evaluated course serves as corridor, preparation, or prerequisite
6. Cost-effectiveness, usually measured in terms of instructor-hour/student-contact ratio or WSCH
7. Student evaluation

For the purposes of evaluating the effectiveness of minicourses, models 1-6 were not considered feasible or applicable for the following reasons

Model 1. = Standardized tests that measure the discrete skills entertained in minicourses are not available.

Model 2. = Development and refinement of valid and reliable instruments for this purpose require more time than can be allowed and still comply with Nova requirements for practicum schedules.

Model 3. = This would involve a longitudinal study that again would interfere with practicum schedule requirements.

Model 4. = Minicourses do not serve as prerequisites; therefore the design is inappropriate.

Model 5. = Attrition rates in minicourses are already known, and developing comparative data on attrition rates in courses concurrently and subsequently taken would involve presently impossible-to-achieve control grouping as well as a longitudinal study.

Model 6. = This factor is already known.

Therefore, for the purposes of this study, a student evaluation survey instrument was developed (see survey, Appendix A) while following prescribed designs and principles (see Sorenson, 1973; Sherman, 1976; Thomas, 1976).

The Objectives of this Study

The objectives of this study were five-fold:

1. to determine the avenue that directed students to minicourses (as reflected in items 1 & 2, Appendix A);
2. to determine the reasons why students enroll in minicourses (as reflected in items 3 & 4);
3. to evaluate aspects of the minicourses' design and methods (as reflected in items 5-8);
4. to evaluate the overall effectiveness of minicourses (as reflected in items 9 & 10);
5. to determine whether students' reason (motivation) for enrolling in and completing minicourses (see item 4, response 3), has any predictive value in determining course effectiveness (as explained later in this practicum under "Procedure for Treating Data").

Assumptions

Because the evaluation survey followed a recommended design and implementation (see Thomas, 1976), it is proposed that the following assumptions were valid or reasonable

1. Students responding to an anonymous survey completed after grades for the courses had been announced responded with frankness and without intimidation.
2. Being informed that their collective and individual responses would be considered seriously as course content and methods are reviewed, students responded with due reflection and deliberation.
3. Students involved in minicourses had a right to register their

perceptions concerning the worth of the courses and had some expectation of determining the continuance, direction, or improvement of the courses.

Hypotheses

Six hypotheses were tested. These are listed together with a rationale for choosing the response criterion for each hypothesis.

Hypothesis One: More than fifty students will respond to response #3, item 4, on the survey. (This criterion was deemed prudent, for if an N of fifty were not achieved, then it would be actuarially difficult to render cells of sufficient size that would lend themselves to chi-square analysis.)

Hypothesis Two: More than fifty percent of students will respond to responses 3 and 4, item 5, on the survey. (Since item 5 is designed to reveal whether students' stated expectations had been fulfilled by the minicourse, it was assumed that more than fifty percent of students completing minicourses would have their expectations fulfilled if recruitment strategies had been forthright and not misleading.)

Hypothesis Three: More than fifty percent of students will respond to responses 3 and 4, item 6, on the survey. (Since it was assumed that a majority of students would be following the recommended enrollment pattern by concurrently taking other courses that required the

skills being treated in minicourses, it was therefore assumed that a simple majority of students should find minicourse treatment immediately helpful in their concurrent curricular pursuits.)

Hypothesis Four: More than fifty percent of students will respond to responses 4 and 5 on items 9 and 10 of the survey. (In order to show that minicourses are effective both in comparison with other courses offered on campus as well as their effectiveness in terms of overall student appraisal, it is posited that a simple majority of students completing minicourses should judge the courses to be very or extremely helpful to them.)

Hypothesis Five: More than fifty percent of students will not respond to any one of the five response possibilities in item 8 of the survey. (Since item 8 was designed to reflect any negative student attitudes toward methods and approaches used in minicourses, it was assumed that a simple majority would not find any single method or approach so ineffective as to occasion more than a fifty percent response.)

Hypothesis Six: Students responding to response #3, item 4, of the survey, will, on items 1-3 and items 5-10, show a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence when compared with those students responding to response alternatives 1, 2, 4, and 5 on said item

and survey and as measured by the chi-square statistical technique. (This hypothesis was devised to direct the study so that student motivation (reason) for taking a minicourse could be (1) identified and then (2) studied as a possible predictive factor in determining future recruitment efforts and revising course methods and content.)

Definitions of Terms

Minicourse = a term convertible with the term workshop; a one-unit, non-transfer, credit/no credit, non-prerequisite, lecture-activity course (1) emphasizing development of reading, writing, listening, notetaking and test-taking skills, (2) involving eighteen hours of instruction over a six-week period, (3) utilizing appropriate media and technology in the instructional process, and (4) assigning individualized, prescribed, out-of-class, and usually audio-tutorial modules or activities for students who request or need additional treatment.

Group A = comprised of those students responding to response 3, item 4, of the evaluation survey and therefore identified as those students that best fit the category of students who benefit from the non traditional and mediated approaches and as studied and described by Roueche (1976).

Group B = comprised of those students responding to responses 1, 2, 4, and 5, item 4, of the evaluation survey, being distinguished from Group A, and therefore identified as students less likely to correspond with those studied and described by Roueche (1976).

PROCEDURE

The Study Design

The study used an anonymous student survey (see Appendix A) administered after completion of the course and after grade assignment in order to (1) determine the avenue that directed students to the course, (2) determine students' reasons for enrolling in the course, (3) evaluate aspects of the courses' design and methods, (4) evaluate the overall effectiveness of the courses, and (5) determine whether students' motivation (expressed reason) for taking the courses has any predictive value in determining course effectiveness. After the initial draft of the survey had been devised, minicourse instructors read and edited the first version, which, after revision, was submitted to twelve former minicourse students, who took the survey then conferred with this participant concerning ambiguous items or wording that might lead to inconsistency of interpretation. Such field-testing completed, the student evaluation survey was again revised and then reproduced in final form and as exhibited in Appendix A.

The Samples

The samples consisted of all students completing Learning Skills 20, 25, 30, and 35 taken at El Camino College during the fall 1976 semester (N=141).

Data Collection Procedures

After the student evaluation survey instrument had been administered at the end of all minicourses held during the fall 1976 semester, data derived from student responses were collected as follows.

1. All responses from student surveys were mark-sensed on computer-compatible response sheets.
2. All written responses in answer to "Other" categories were hand recorded, grouped, and generically categorized when possible.
3. All response sheets were submitted for computer analysis and the results of this tabulation as well as the data derived from step 2 above were augmented to produce a comprehensive response tabulation (see Appendix B).
4. Response sheets for those students responding to response #3, item 4, of the survey, were separated from response sheets representing all other students involved in the study, and the data derived from both groups were tabulated separately and as displayed in Appendix C.
5. The responses derived from step 4 above were arranged in cells, and certain cells were eliminated or coalesced in instances that required this adjustment and as indicated in Appendix D. These data were submitted to chi-square comparison analysis procedure and results of this comparison are listed in Appendix D.

Procedure for Treating Data

To verify or negate the aforementioned hypotheses, the data collected were treated to obtain the following results.

Hypothesis One. Since 81 students or 57.4% responded to response 3, item 4 (see Appendix B, item 4), Hypothesis One was accepted and an

actuarial situation conducive to chi-square application was achieved.

Hypothesis Two. Since 73 students or 51.7% responded to responses 3 and 4, item 5 (see Appendix B, item 5), Hypothesis Two was accepted.

Hypothesis Three. Since 93 students or 66% responded to responses 3 and 4, item 6 (see Appendix B, item 6) Hypothesis Three was accepted.

Hypothesis Four. Since 96 students or 68.1% responded to responses 4 and 5, item 9; and since 103 students or 73% responded to responses 3 and 4, item 10, Hypothesis Four was accepted (see Appendix B, items 9 and 10).

Hypothesis Five. Since no more than 39 or 27.7% of the students responded to any one response category in item 8, Hypothesis Five was accepted (see item 8, Appendix B).

Hypothesis Six . Chi-Square comparison of Group A and Group B responses to items 1-3 and items 5-10 of the student evaluation survey (see Appendix D) indicates that Hypothesis Six was rejected except that the item 3 comparison proved to be significant at the .01 level of confidence, and the item 7 comparison proved to be significant at the .001 level of confidence. Therefore, except for items 3 and 7, both of which reflect attitudes towards specific features, methods, and/or approaches inherent and emphasized in minicourses, it appears that Group A and Group B do not differ appreciably in their evaluation of minicourses; nor is there a significant difference in the kind of recruitment strategies that persuaded them to enroll in the course(s).

Discussion, Implications and Recommendations

Discussion

The first objective of this study was to determine the avenue that

directed students to and influenced them to enroll in minicourses. It is interesting to note that the class Schedule and that College counselors were most influential in apprising students of the minicourses' existence (see item 1, Appendix B). However, in terms of influence (see item 2), only counselors seem to be very persuasive, and, interestingly, 31 students or 22 percent viewed themselves as being the "factor" that persuaded them to enroll in a minicourse. That so many students perceived this influence as "internal" is enigmatic; however, that counselors seem to be consistently the agency that informs students about minicourses and are also the agents who influence students to take minicourses is certainly worthy of notice in terms of recruitment.

Also related to recruitment strategies and to the second objective of this study is the data derived from item 3 of this survey. These data indicate that 97 or 68.8 percent of the students perceive that they were attracted to enroll in minicourses because these courses concentrate on a single learning skill, and 25 or 17.7 percent of the students were attracted because minicourses were only six weeks in duration (see item 3, Appendix B). But perhaps more significant, and in terms of internal motivating factors, is the fact that their chief reason for enrolling in a minicourse was to "become a more efficient and self-confident learner for your own satisfaction." This response level was more than twice as great as any of the response levels registered in the other four response categories (see item 4, Appendix B). Thus, inasmuch as Roueche's study (1976) indicates that students wishing to build self-confidence and to learn more effectively

are those that (1) are less interested in "degreesmanship" and (2) are more interested in building life-related learning skills and that these students are more deserving of attention as curriculum is revised, it is interesting that more than half of the students enrolled in minicourses appear to fill Roueche's description.

The third objective of the study was to evaluate the minicourses' design and methods. Item 5 was designed to measure course satisfaction and/or effectiveness in terms of student expectation upon entering the courses and, as has been indicated, the response criterion for the item was barely exceeded. Responses to item 6 were even more encouraging because students were asked to indicate whether the content or skills building strategies involved in minicourses were immediately effective in helping students to achieve in concurrent courses, and the 66 percent positive response to this item is encouraging (see item 6, Appendix B). Again the data derived from item 7 (see Appendix B) are interesting inasmuch as the percentage of student responses rather closely approximate the percentage of time exerted to carry out each method or approach listed. Therefore, student perceptions on this item suggest that minicourse practitioners should not be overly concerned about revision of delivery tactics. However, the fact that 39 students or 27.7 percent indicated that "prescribed out-of-class activities, projects, or modules" were least helpful or useful to students is interpreted as either (1) indication that few students had been <u>assigned</u> to or had <u>participated</u> in such activities or (2) one quarter of the students did not indeed find such measures or tactics useful.

In terms of the fourth objective of this study, evaluating the overall effectiveness of minicourses, it is interesting that positive responses to item 9 were registered by 96 students or 68.1% and that positive responses to item 10 were registered by 103 students or 73%, indicating reasonable consistency in these two measures and giving more weight to the reliability of the evaluation survey.

The study's fifth objective is focused on identifying students who might best be served by minicourses (Group A) and then searching out those aspects of the courses that might be most applicable to or least helpful to them. It can be noticed that Group A responses for response 3, item 3, are significantly greater than those of Group B. It can also be noticed that Group A responses to response 2, item 3, are significantly less than those of Group B (see Appendix C). Such would indicate that (1) Group A students are more interested in the fact that minicourses concentrate on a single learning skill and that (2) Group B students find the minicourses' short duration appealing. Again, comparison of the responses of these two groups as they reacted to item 7 (see Appendix C) indicates that Group A finds the use of media most helpful while Group B favors short lecture/discussion sessions.

Implications

At the local level, the implications of this study focus chiefly on matters of recruitment, especially since it was learned that the class Schedule and also College counselors are the chief sources of recruitment. Even more important to the recruitment process is the fact that counselors are extremely influential in their recommendations

and that counselors are the prominent recommending source directing students to minicourses.

At both the local and national levels implications of this study involve both the treatment employed in minicourses as well as the evaluation by students of this treatment. It is interesting that these implications are rather closely related to Roueche's (1976) study of non traditional students. For instance, Roueche states that the non traditional student typically seeks immediate pay-off in the courses he takes; and the fact that the students in this study indicate their preference for (1) a short course, (2) a course involving a single learning skill, and (3) a course that helps them succeed in concurrent courses seems to corroborate Roueche's findings. Again, Roueche's contention that the use of individualized, mediated instructional delivery systems is effective with non traditional students is borne out in this study, especially inasmuch as Group A students indicated their preference for mediated strategies used in minicourses.

Finally, the fact that Group A students and Group B students registered significantly different attitudes on only two items in the survey may be yet another indication that what many researchers have been saying for some time is true: What is good or suitable for the non traditional student is good and suitable for those students not so classified.

Recommendations

At the local level, it is recommended that

(1) minicourses continue to be offered at the optimum scheduling level,

(2) minicourses be featured in a special section of subsequent class Schedules,

(3) increased efforts be employed to apprise counselors of minicourse effectiveness and of counselor effectiveness in directing students to minicourses,

(4) minicourse entries in both the College Catalog and the class Schedule be edited in order to emphasize the fact that each minicourse concentrates on a single learning skill.

At the national level, it is hoped that the results of this study will be considered as (1) a serious effort to effect curricular evaluation and improvement through student involvement and an evaluative design that obtains information that only students can provide, and (2) part of the research matrix being developed to improve instructional conditions so that they more effectively serve non traditional students.

REFERENCES

Cross, P. "The Elusive Goal of Educational Equality," an unpublished paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education, San Diego, California, October 10, 1974.

Editors of Change. "How to Survive in College," Report on Teaching, Number Two, 1976, 48.

Fairbanks, M. "Relationship Between Research Control and Reported Results of College Reading Improvement Programs" in Twenty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, G. McNinch and W. Miller (Eds.), Clemson, South Carolina, 1975, 80-93.

Meeth, R. "The Stateless Art of Teaching Evaluation," Report on Teaching, Number Two, Editors of Change Magazine, 1976, 3-5.

Milton, O. Alternatives to the Traditional, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Roueche, J. Statements Made Concerning Unpublished Research, Nova Institute, Hollywood, Florida, August 4, 1976.

Scarafiotti, C. and Schooland, L. "Dynamics of TNT (Teaching Notetaking Techniques)," Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference of the Western College Reading Association, G. Kerstiens (Ed.), Long Beach, California, 1974, 143-148.

Sherman, T. "Trick or Trait: A Look at Student Evaluation of Instruction," 16, Educational Technology, April 1976, 38-40.

Sorenson, G. "Evaluation for the Improvement of Instructional Programs," in Toward Instructional Accountability, John Roueche and Barton Herrscher (Eds.), Palo Alto: Westinghouse Learning Press, 1973, 158-169.

Spaulding, N. "Five Mini-Courses in Study Skills," Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference of the Western College Reading Association, G. Kerstiens (Ed.), Long Beach, California, 1974, 179-182.

Sweiger, J. "Designs and Organizational Structure of Junior and Community College Reading Programs Across the Country," in Twenty-First Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, F. P. Greene (Ed.), II, Boone, North Carolina, 1972, 1-7.

Thomas, I. "Considerations of Course Evaluation in Higher Education," 16, Educational Technology, April 1976, 32-38.

Trent, J. and Cohen, A. "Research on Teaching in Higher Education," Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, R. M. W. Travers (Ed.), Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1973.

Vaughan, G., Elosser, B., and Flynn, R. Consumerism Comes to the Community College. Topical Paper No. 55, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Los Angeles, UCLA, 1976.

Worthen, R. Junior College English: Which Way? National Council of Teachers of English, California, Diablo Valley College, 1967.

Wittrock, M. "The Evaluation of Instruction," in Toward Instructional Accountability, John Roueche and Barton Herrscher (Eds.), Palo Alto: Westinghouse Press, 1973, 116-129.

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Learning Assistance Center

MINICOURSE STUDENT EVALUATION SURVEY

DIRECTIONS:
1. Please do not write your name on this survey.
2. Read the entire survey through before you fill it out.
3. Write only one response for each item on this survey.
4. Please return the survey to the box at the back of the room when you have completed it and as you are leaving.

1. You first learned about this workshop --

___ 1. in the Class Schedule

___ 2. in the College Catalog

___ 3. from a counselor

___ 4. from an instructor

___ 5. from another student

___ 6. Other (Please specify) _____

2. You were influenced to take this workshop by --

___ 1. the Class Schedule

___ 2. the College Catalog

___ 3. a counselor

___ 4. an instructor

___ 5. another student

___ 6. Other (Please specify) _____

3. The feature that appealed to you most about this workshop was that it --

___ 1. is a credit/no credit class

___ 2. is a short class, only 6 weeks long

___ 3. concentrates on one learning skill

___ 4. can be taken at different times during the semester

___ 5. has no prerequisite

___ 6. Other (Please specify) _____

4. Your chief reason for enrolling in this workshop was to --

___ 1. make better grades

___ 2. make it easier to get the grades you want.

___ 3. become a more efficient and self-confident learner for your own satisfaction

___ 4. earn one unit of credit

___ 5. Other (Please specify) _____

5. Considering your reason for enrolling in this workshop (indicated in item 4 above), the workshop --

___ 1. has not fulfilled your expectations

___ 2. has partially fulfilled your expectations

___ 3. has completely fulfilled your expectations

___ 4. has more than fulfilled your expectations

6. In helping you learn in another course or courses you are presently taking, you believe this workshop to be --

___ 1. not helpful at all

___ 2. somewhat helpful

___ 3. quite a bit of help

___ 4. very helpful

___ 5. No opinion because you are not taking another course that requires these skills

7. The method or approach you found most useful or helpful in this workshop is --

___ 1. the use of media -- tapes, films, overhead projector, VTR recordings

___ 2. short lecture/discussion sessions

___ 3. in-class skills activities or exercises

___ 4. prescribed out-of-class activities, projects, or modules

___ 5. Other (Please specify) _____

8. The method or approach you found least useful or helpful in this workshop is --

___ 1. the use of media -- tapes, films, overhead projector, VTR recordings

___ 2. short lecture/discussion sessions

___ 3. in-class skills activities or exercises

___ 4. prescribed out-of-class activities, projects, or modules

___ 5. Other (Please specify) _____

9. In comparison to other college courses you have completed, this one ranks as --

___ 1. not helpful or useful

___ 2. very little help or use

___ 3. so-so

___ 4. a lot of help

___ 5. extremely helpful or useful

___ 6. no opinion because you have not taken other College courses

10. Overall, you believe the workshop was of the following benefit to you:

___ 1. no help at all

___ 2. very little help

___ 3. so-so

___ 4. a lot of help

___ 5. extremely helpful

SURVEY RESPONSES OF ALL STUDENTS COMPLETING MINICOURSES (N=141)

ITEM 1

You first learned about this workshop --

N	%	Response
48	34.0	1. in the Class Schedule
25	17.7	2. in the College Catalog
33	23.4	3. from a counselor
9	6.4	4. from an instructor
13	9.2	5. from another student
13	9.2	6. Other

N	%	Other Responses
8	5.7	Learning Center Poster
5	3.5	Other Campus Office

ITEM 2

You were influenced to take this workshop by --

N	%	Response
25	17.7	1. the Class Schedule
17	12.1	2. the College Catalog
33	23.4	3. a counselor
9	4.3	4. an instructor
20	14.2	5. another student
40	28.4	6. Other

N	%	Other Responses
31	22.0	Self
3	2.1	Family
4	2.8	Other Campus Office
2	1.4	Learning Center Poster

ITEM 3

The feature that appealed to you most about this workshop was that it --

N	%	Response
7	5.0	1. is a credit/no credit class
25	17.7	2. is a short class, only 6 weeks long
97	68.8	3. concentrates on one learning skill
3	2.1	4. can be taken at different times during the semester
3	2.1	5. has no prerequisite
6	4.3	6. Other

N	%	Other Responses
5	3.5	Teaches you how to learn
1	0.7	All of the above

ITEM 4

Your chief reason for enrolling in this workshop was to --

N	%	Response
11	7.8	1. make better grades
30	21.3	2. make it easier to get the grades you want
81	57.4	3. become a more efficient and self-confident learner for your own satisfaction
12	8.5	4. earn one unit of credit
7	5.0	5. Other

N	%	Other Responses
7	5.0	Combinations of responses 1-4

ITEM 5

Considering your reason for enrolling in this workshop (indicated in item 4 above), the workshop --

N	%	Response
4	2.8	1. has not fulfilled your expectations
64	45.4	2. has partially fulfilled your expectations
57	40.4	3. has completely fulfilled your expectations
16	11.3	4. has more than fulfilled your expectations

ITEM 6

In helping you learn in another course or courses you are presently taking, you believe this workshop to be --

N	%	Response
3	2.1	1. not helpful at all
32	22.7	2. somewhat helpful
39	27.7	3. quite a bit of help
54	38.3	4. very helpful
13	9.2	5. No opinion because you are not taking another course that requires these skills

ITEM 7

The method or approach you found most useful or helpful in this workshop is --

N	%	Response
20	14.2	1. the use of media - tapes, films, overhead projector, VTR recordings
38	27.0	2. short lecture/discussion sessions
71	50.4	3. in-class skills activities or exercises
6	4.3	4. prescribed out-of-class activities, projects, or modules
5	3.5	5. Other

N	%	Other Responses
4	2.8	All are useful
1	.7	Guest speakers

ITEM 8

The method or approach you found least useful or helpful in this workshop is --

N	%	Response
29	20.6	1. the use of media - tapes, films, overhead projector, VTR recordings
17	12.1	2. short lecture/discussion sessions
28	19.9	3. in-class skills activities or exercises
39	27.7	4. prescribed out-of-class activities, projects, or modules

ITEM 8 (cont.)

N	%	Response
27	19.1	5. Other

N	%	Other Responses
16	11.3	All were helpful; no method was less helpful
1	.7	Small group activities
10	7.0	Student did not specify method or approach

ITEM 9

In comparison to other college courses you have completed, this one ranks as --

N	%	Response
2	1.4	1. not helpful or useful
7	5.0	2. very little help or use
29	20.6	3. so-so
49	34.8	4. a lot of help
47	33.3	5. extremely helpful or useful
6	4.3	6. no opinion becuase you have not taken other college courses

ITEM 10

Overall, you believe the workshop was of the following benefit to you:

N	%	Response
1	.7	1. no help at all
7	5.0	2. very little help
29	20.6	3. so-so
67	47.5	4. a lot of help
36	25.5	5. extremely helpful

APPENDIX C

RESPONSE SUMMARY OF GROUP A (N=81)

Response	1		2		3		4		5		6	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Item 1	28.	34.6	16.	19.8	16.	19.8	5.	6.2	9.	11.1	7.	8.6
Item 2	10.	12.3	11.	13.6	19.	23.5	6.	7.4	12.	14.8	23.	28.4
Item 3	2.	2.5	8.	9.9	66.	81.5	1.	1.2	2.	2.5	2.	2.5
Item 4	0.	0.0	0.	0.0	81.	100.0	0.	0.0	0.	0.0		
Item 5	2.	2.5	34.	42.0	38.	46.9	7.	8.6				
Item 6	2.	2.5	15.	18.5	24.	29.6	33.	40.7	7.	8.6		
Item 7	16.	19.8	15.	18.5	43.	53.1	4.	4.9	3.	3.7		
Item 8	19.	23.5	10.	12.3	15.	18.5	19.	23.5	18.	22.2		
Item 9	0.	0.0	5.	6.2	16.	19.8	24.	29.6	32.	39.5	4.	4.9
Item 10	0.	0.0	4.	4.9	16.	19.8	35.	43.2	26.	32.1		

RESPONSE SUMMARY OF GROUP B (N=60)

Response	1		2		3		4		5		6	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Item 1	20.	33.3	9.	15.0	17.	28.3	4.	6.7	4.	6.7	6.	10.0
Item 2	15.	25.0	6.	10.0	14.	23.3	0.	0.0	8.	13.3	17.	28.3
Item 3	5.	8.3	17.	28.3	31.	51.7	2.	3.3	1.	1.7	4.	6.7
Item 4	11.	18.3	30.	50.0	0.	0.0	12.	20.0	7.	11.7		
Item 5	2.	3.3	30.	50.0	19.	31.7	9.	15.0				
Item 6	1.	1.7	17.	28.3	15.	25.0	21.	35.0	6.	10.0		
Item 7	4.	6.7	23.	38.3	28.	46.7	2.	3.3	2.	3.3		
Item 8	10.	16.7	7.	11.7	13.	21.7	20.	33.3	9.	15.0		
Item 9	2.	3.3	2.	3.3	13.	21.7	25.	41.7	15.	25.0	2.	3.3
Item 10	1.	1.7	3.	5.0	13.	21.7	32.	53.3	10.	16.7		

CHI-SQUARE RESPONSE COMPARISON OF GROUP A (N=81) AND GROUP B (N=60) ITEMS 1-3 AND 5-10, COURSE EVALUATION SURVEY

Significance

Item #1

	1	2	3	4	5	6
A	28	16	16	5	9	7
B	20	9	17	4	4	6

↓

A	28	16	16	5	9	7
B	20	9	17	4	4	6

Not Significant

Item #2

	1	2	3	4	5	6
A	10	11	19	6	12	23
B	15	6	14	0	8	17

↓

A	10	11	19	12	23
B	15	6	14	8	17

Not Significant

Item #3

	1	2	3	4	5	6
A	2	8	66	1	2	2
B	5	17	31	2	1	4

↓

A	2	8	66	1	2	2
B	5	17	31	2	1	4

Significant at the .01 Level of Confidence

Significance

Item #5

	1	2	3	4
A	2	34	38	7
B	2	30	19	9

↓

A		36	38	7
B		32	19	9

Not Significant

Item #6

	1	2	3	4	5
A	2	15	24	33	7
B	1	17	15	21	6

↓

A		17	24	33	7
B		18	15	21	6

Not Significant

Item #7

	1	2	3	4	5
A	16	15	43	4	3
B	4	23	28	2	2

↓

A	16	5	43	4	3
B	4	23	28	2	2

Significant at the .001 Level of Confidence

Significance

Item #8

	1	2	3	4	5
A	19	10	15	19	18
B	10	7	13	20	9

↓

A	19	10	15	19	18
B	10	7	13	20	9

Not Significant

Item #9

	1	2	3	4	5	6
A	0	5	16	24	32	4
B	2	2	13	25	15	2

↓

A	5	16	24	32	4
B	4	13	25	15	2

Not Significant

Item #10

	1	2	3	4	5
A	0	4	16	35	26
B	1	3	13	32	10

↓

A	4	16	35	26
B	4	13	32	10

Not Significant

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
FEB 4 1977
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES